



Consultation, IA &lt;consultation@bia.gov&gt;

---

## Discussion Draft Rule - 25 CFR 83

9 messages

---

**Connie Salles** <connie@toppsinc.com>

Tue, Aug 13, 2013 at 10:34 AM

To: consultation@bia.gov

Cc: achoctaw@yahoo.com

- **Ms. Elizabeth Appel**  
Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action – Indian Affairs  
1849 C Street, NW  
MS 4141-MIB  
Washington, DC 20240  
[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)

cc: [achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)

Re: Discussion Draft Rule- 25 CFR 83

I CONNIE EBARB SALLES support the recommendations of the Choctaw-Apache Community of Ebarb (petitioner #37) sent in letter dated 8/12/2013 from the Chairman and Tribal Council.

- The modified 83.6(d)(1) requiring that evidence be viewed "in a light most favorable to the petitioner" makes sense.
- I agree with proposed changes to eliminate Criteria (a), external observers identify the group as "Indian."
- OFA interpretations of "tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity" have been overly stringent. Groups that have stayed together and maintained an Indian community identity is evidence of their intention to form a political and cultural community with one another. The OFA needs to adopt a more flexible interpretation regarding petitioners that formed in historical times through the combination of tribes and tribal fragments.
- Research support and advice should be an ongoing obligation of the federal government for groups showing evidence of Indian ancestry, up until the moment of a final decision.
- Potentially affected property owners and economic motivations for ensuring a tribe is never recognized should not have a louder voice than those who know a tribe's history and ethnology.

American Indians have survived in many forms, and it is important to nurture them where they persist. Tribes that have not been federally recognized are not always going to look exactly like tribes that have been federally recognized for hundreds of years, for a variety of reasons. They are not better or worse than federally recognized groups, just different. The federal government is legally and morally obligated to recognize Indigenous communities' status as indigenous polities that have survived hundreds of years despite assimilationist pressures.

Sincerely,  
CONNIE EBARB SALLES -

<http://www.indian.senate.gov/public/ files/sciatestimony1.pdf>

[www.indian.senate.gov](http://www.indian.senate.gov)

Thanks kindly,

Connie Salles

Business Office Manager/Secretary

***Topps Western World &***

***Reeve Tractors, LLC***

***3003 Topps Trail***

***Bossier City, LA 71112***

T: (318) 746-1836

F: (318) 746-8230

E: [connie@toppsinc.com](mailto:connie@toppsinc.com)

---

**Connie Salles** <clsalles318@att.net>

Tue, Aug 13, 2013 at 11:42 AM

Reply-To: Connie Salles <clsalles318@att.net>

To: "consultation@bia.gov" <consultation@bia.gov>

Cc: "achoctaw@yahoo.com" <achoctaw@yahoo.com>

**Ms. Elizabeth Appel**

**Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action – Indian Affairs**

**1849 C Street, NW**

**MS 4141-MIB**

**Washington, DC 20240**

[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)

**cc: [achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)**

**Re: Discussion Draft Rule- 25 CFR 83**

**I \_C. L. SALLES\_\_support the recommendations of the Choctaw-Apache Community of Ebarb (petitioner #37) sent in letter dated 8/12/2013 from the Chairman and Tribal Council.**

- The modified 83.6(d)(1) requiring that evidence be viewed "in a light most favorable to the petitioner" makes sense.
- I agree with proposed changes to eliminate Criteria (a), external observers identify the group as "Indian."
- OFA interpretations of "tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity" have been overly stringent. Groups that have stayed together and maintained an Indian community identity is evidence of their intention to form a political and cultural community with one another. The OFA needs to adopt a more flexible interpretation regarding petitioners that formed in historical times through the combination of tribes and tribal fragments.
- Research support and advice should be an ongoing obligation of the federal government for groups showing evidence of Indian ancestry, up until the moment of a final decision.
- Potentially affected property owners and economic motivations for ensuring a tribe is never recognized should not have a louder voice than those who know a tribe's history and ethnology.

American Indians have survived in many forms, and it is important to nurture them where they persist. Tribes that have not been federally recognized are not always going to look exactly like tribes that have been federally recognized for hundreds of years, for a variety of reasons. They are not better or worse than federally recognized groups, just different. The federal government is legally and morally obligated to recognize Indigenous communities' status as indigenous polities that have survived hundreds of years despite assimilationist pressures.

Sincerely,

C. L. SALLES -

-

---

Connie S <conniegoerner@hotmail.com>  
To: "consultation@bia.gov" <consultation@bia.gov>  
Cc: "achoctaw@yahoo.com" <achoctaw@yahoo.com>

Tue, Aug 13, 2013 at 12:11 PM

- Ms. Elizabeth Appel  
Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action – Indian Affairs  
1849 C Street, NW  
MS 4141-MIB  
Washington, DC 20240

[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)

cc: [achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)

Re: Discussion Draft Rule- 25 CFR 83

I CONNIE EBARB GOERNER SALLES support the recommendations of the Choctaw-Apache Community of Ebarb (petitioner #37) sent in letter dated 8/12/2013 from the Chairman and Tribal Council.

- The modified 83.6(d)(1) requiring that evidence be viewed "in a light most favorable to the petitioner" makes sense.
- I agree with proposed changes to eliminate Criteria (a), external observers identify the group as "Indian."
- OFA interpretations of "tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity" have been overly stringent. Groups that have stayed together and maintained an Indian community identity is evidence of their intention to form a political and cultural community with one another. The OFA needs to adopt a more flexible interpretation regarding petitioners that formed in historical times through the combination of tribes and tribal fragments.
- Research support and advice should be an ongoing obligation of the federal government for groups showing evidence of Indian ancestry, up until the moment of a final decision.
- Potentially affected property owners and economic motivations for ensuring a tribe is never recognized should not have a louder voice than those who know a tribe's history and ethnology.

American Indians have survived in many forms, and it is important to nurture them where they persist. Tribes that have not been federally recognized are not always going to look exactly like tribes that have been federally recognized for hundreds of years, for a variety of reasons. They are not better or worse than federally recognized groups, just different. The federal government is legally and morally obligated to recognize Indigenous communities' status as indigenous polities that have survived hundreds of years despite assimilationist pressures.

Sincerely,

CONNIE EBARB GOERNER SALLES -

-

---

Connie S <[conniegoerner@hotmail.com](mailto:conniegoerner@hotmail.com)>

To: "[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)" <[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)>

Cc: "[achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)" <[achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)>

Tue, Aug 13, 2013 at 12:13 PM

- Ms. Elizabeth Appel  
Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action – Indian Affairs  
1849 C Street, NW  
MS 4141-MIB  
Washington, DC 20240  
[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)

cc: [achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)

Re: Discussion Draft Rule- 25 CFR 83

I PEYTON SCOTT GOERNER support the recommendations of the Choctaw-Apache Community of Ebarb (petitioner #37) sent in letter dated 8/12/2013 from the Chairman and Tribal Council.

- The modified 83.6(d)(1) requiring that evidence be viewed "in a light most favorable to the petitioner" makes sense.
- I agree with proposed changes to eliminate Criteria (a), external observers identify the group as "Indian."
- OFA interpretations of "tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity" have been overly stringent. Groups that have stayed together and maintained an Indian community identity is evidence of their intention to form a political and cultural community with one another. The OFA needs to adopt a more flexible interpretation regarding petitioners that formed in historical times through the combination of tribes and tribal fragments.
- Research support and advice should be an ongoing obligation of the federal government for groups showing evidence of Indian ancestry, up until the moment of a final decision.
- Potentially affected property owners and economic motivations for ensuring a tribe is never recognized should not have a louder voice than those who know a tribe's history and ethnology.

American Indians have survived in many forms, and it is important to nurture them where they persist. Tribes that have not been federally recognized are not always going to look exactly like tribes that have been federally recognized for hundreds of years, for a variety of reasons. They are not better or worse than federally recognized groups, just different. The federal government is legally and morally obligated to recognize Indigenous communities' status as indigenous polities that have survived hundreds of years despite assimilationist pressures.

Sincerely,

PEYTON SCOTT GOERNER -

---

Connie S <[conniegoerner@hotmail.com](mailto:conniegoerner@hotmail.com)>  
To: "consultation@bia.gov" <[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)>  
Cc: "achoctaw@yahoo.com" <[achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)>

Tue, Aug 13, 2013 at 12:13 PM

- Ms. Elizabeth Appel  
Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action – Indian Affairs

1849 C Street, NW  
MS 4141-MIB  
Washington, DC 20240  
[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)

cc: [achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)

Re: Discussion Draft Rule- 25 CFR 83

I DUSTIN KYLE GOERNER support the recommendations of the Choctaw-Apache Community of Ebarb (petitioner #37) sent in letter dated 8/12/2013 from the Chairman and Tribal Council.

- The modified 83.6(d)(1) requiring that evidence be viewed "in a light most favorable to the petitioner" makes sense.

- I agree with proposed changes to eliminate Criteria (a), external observers identify the group as "Indian."

- OFA interpretations of "tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity" have been overly stringent. Groups that have stayed together and maintained an Indian community identity is evidence of their intention to form a political and cultural community with one another. The OFA needs to adopt a more flexible interpretation regarding petitioners that formed in historical times through the combination of tribes and tribal fragments.

- Research support and advice should be an ongoing obligation of the federal government for groups showing evidence of Indian ancestry, up until the moment of a final decision.

- Potentially affected property owners and economic motivations for ensuring a tribe is never recognized should not have a louder voice than those who know a tribe's history and ethnology.

American Indians have survived in many forms, and it is important to nurture them where they persist. Tribes that have not been federally recognized are not always going to look exactly like tribes that have been federally recognized for hundreds of years, for a variety of reasons. They are not better or worse than federally recognized groups, just different. The federal government is legally and morally obligated to recognize Indigenous communities' status as indigenous polities that have survived hundreds of years despite assimilationist pressures.

Sincerely,

DUSTIN KYLE GOERNER -

---

Connie S <[conniegoerner@hotmail.com](mailto:conniegoerner@hotmail.com)>

Tue, Aug 13, 2013 at 12:14 PM

To: CONNIE TOPPS WESTERN WEAR <[connie@toppsinc.com](mailto:connie@toppsinc.com)>, "[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)" <[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)>

Cc: "[achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)" <[achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)>

- Ms. Elizabeth Appel  
Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action – Indian Affairs

1849 C Street, NW  
MS 4141-MIB  
Washington, DC 20240  
[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)

cc: [achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)

Re: Discussion Draft Rule- 25 CFR 83

I TARYN ANN GOERNER TAYLOR support the recommendations of the Choctaw-Apache Community of Ebarb (petitioner #37) sent in letter dated 8/12/2013 from the Chairman and Tribal Council.

- The modified 83.6(d)(1) requiring that evidence be viewed "in a light most favorable to the petitioner" makes sense.
- I agree with proposed changes to eliminate Criteria (a), external observers identify the group as "Indian."

- OFA interpretations of "tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity" have been overly stringent. Groups that have stayed together and maintained an Indian community identity is evidence of their intention to form a political and cultural community with one another. The OFA needs to adopt a more flexible interpretation regarding petitioners that formed in historical times through the combination of tribes and tribal fragments.

- Research support and advice should be an ongoing obligation of the federal government for groups showing evidence of Indian ancestry, up until the moment of a final decision.

- Potentially affected property owners and economic motivations for ensuring a tribe is never recognized should not have a louder voice than those who know a tribe's history and ethnology.

American Indians have survived in many forms, and it is important to nurture them where they persist. Tribes that have not been federally recognized are not always going to look exactly like tribes that have been federally recognized for hundreds of years, for a variety of reasons. They are not better or worse than federally recognized groups, just different. The federal government is legally and morally obligated to recognize Indigenous communities' status as indigenous polities that have survived hundreds of years despite assimilationist pressures.

Sincerely,  
TARYN ANN GOERNER TAYLOR -

---

Connie S <[conniegoerner@hotmail.com](mailto:conniegoerner@hotmail.com)>

Tue, Aug 13, 2013 at 12:15 PM

To: CONNIE TOPPS WESTERN WEAR <[connie@toppsinc.com](mailto:connie@toppsinc.com)>, "consultation@bia.gov" <[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)>

Cc: "achoctaw@yahoo.com" <[achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)>

- Ms. Elizabeth Appel

Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action – Indian Affairs  
1849 C Street, NW  
MS 4141-MIB  
Washington, DC 20240  
[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)

cc: [achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)

Re: Discussion Draft Rule- 25 CFR 83

I KINLEIGH GRACE TAYLOR support the recommendations of the Choctaw-Apache Community of Ebarb (petitioner #37) sent in letter dated 8/12/2013 from the Chairman and Tribal Council.

- The modified 83.6(d)(1) requiring that evidence be viewed "in a light most favorable to the petitioner" makes sense.
- I agree with proposed changes to eliminate Criteria (a), external observers identify the group as "Indian."
- OFA interpretations of "tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity" have been overly stringent. Groups that have stayed together and maintained an Indian community identity is evidence of their intention to form a political and cultural community with one another. The OFA needs to adopt a more flexible interpretation regarding petitioners that formed in historical times through the combination of tribes and tribal fragments.
- Research support and advice should be an ongoing obligation of the federal government for groups showing evidence of Indian ancestry, up until the moment of a final decision.
- Potentially affected property owners and economic motivations for ensuring a tribe is never recognized should not have a louder voice than those who know a tribe's history and ethnology.

American Indians have survived in many forms, and it is important to nurture them where they persist. Tribes that have not been federally recognized are not always going to look exactly like tribes that have been federally recognized for hundreds of years, for a variety of reasons. They are not better or worse than federally recognized groups, just different. The federal government is legally and morally obligated to recognize Indigenous communities' status as indigenous polities that have survived hundreds of years despite assimilationist pressures.

Sincerely,  
KINLEIGH GRACE TAYLOR -

---

Connie S <[conniegoerner@hotmail.com](mailto:conniegoerner@hotmail.com)>  
To: "[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)" <[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)>  
Cc: "[achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)" <[achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)>

Tue, Aug 13, 2013 at 12:17 PM

- Ms. Elizabeth Appel



Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action – Indian Affairs  
1849 C Street, NW  
MS 4141-MIB  
Washington, DC 20240  
[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)

cc: [achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)

Re: Discussion Draft Rule- 25 CFR 83

I \_\_WILLIAM RIAL TAYLOR, III\_\_ support the recommendations of the Choctaw-Apache Community of Ebarb (petitioner #37) sent in letter dated 8/12/2013 from the Chairman and Tribal Council.

- The modified 83.6(d)(1) requiring that evidence be viewed "in a light most favorable to the petitioner" makes sense.
- I agree with proposed changes to eliminate Criteria (a), external observers identify the group as "Indian."
- OFA interpretations of "tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity" have been overly stringent. Groups that have stayed together and maintained an Indian community identity is evidence of their intention to form a political and cultural community with one another. The OFA needs to adopt a more flexible interpretation regarding petitioners that formed in historical times through the combination of tribes and tribal fragments.
- Research support and advice should be an ongoing obligation of the federal government for groups showing evidence of Indian ancestry, up until the moment of a final decision.
- Potentially affected property owners and economic motivations for ensuring a tribe is never recognized should not have a louder voice than those who know a tribe's history and ethnology.

American Indians have survived in many forms, and it is important to nurture them where they persist. Tribes that have not been federally recognized are not always going to look exactly like tribes that have been federally recognized for hundreds of years, for a variety of reasons. They are not better or worse than federally recognized groups, just different. The federal government is legally and morally obligated to recognize Indigenous communities' status as indigenous polities that have survived hundreds of years despite assimilationist pressures.

Sincerely,  
\_\_WILLIAM RIAL TAYLOR, III\_\_\_\_ -

---

Connie S <[conniegoerner@hotmail.com](mailto:conniegoerner@hotmail.com)>  
To: "[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)" <[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)>  
Cc: "[achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)" <[achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)>

Tue, Aug 13, 2013 at 12:19 PM

- Ms. Elizabeth Appel

**Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action – Indian Affairs****1849 C Street, NW****MS 4141-MIB****Washington, DC 20240**[consultation@bia.gov](mailto:consultation@bia.gov)cc: [achoctaw@yahoo.com](mailto:achoctaw@yahoo.com)**Re: Discussion Draft Rule- 25 CFR 83**

I AUDREY KAMILLE TAYLOR support the recommendations of the Choctaw-Apache Community of Ebarb (petitioner #37) sent in letter dated 8/12/2013 from the Chairman and Tribal Council.

- The modified 83.6(d)(1) requiring that evidence be viewed "in a light most favorable to the petitioner" makes sense.
- I agree with proposed changes to eliminate Criteria (a), external observers identify the group as "Indian."
- OFA interpretations of "tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity" have been overly stringent. Groups that have stayed together and maintained an Indian community identity is evidence of their intention to form a political and cultural community with one another. The OFA needs to adopt a more flexible interpretation regarding petitioners that formed in historical times through the combination of tribes and tribal fragments.
- Research support and advice should be an ongoing obligation of the federal government for groups showing evidence of Indian ancestry, up until the moment of a final decision.
- Potentially affected property owners and economic motivations for ensuring a tribe is never recognized should not have a louder voice than those who know a tribe's history and ethnology.

American Indians have survived in many forms, and it is important to nurture them where they persist. Tribes that have not been federally recognized are not always going to look exactly like tribes that have been federally recognized for hundreds of years, for a variety of reasons. They are not better or worse than federally recognized groups, just different. The federal government is legally and morally obligated to recognize Indigenous communities' status as indigenous polities that have survived hundreds of years despite assimilationist pressures.

Sincerely,

AUDREY KAMILLE TAYLOR -